ADDRESS

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA,

APRIL 29, 1874,

ON THE MOTION FOR ADOPTING THE SECOND REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE,

ON

PROHIBITION.

BY

GEORGE W. ROSS, M.P.,
P. G. W. P., SONS OF TEMPERANCE.

Printed by order of the Executive of the Grand Division, Sons of Temperance of Ontario, and for Sale by the Grand Scribe, Mr. Thomas Webster, Brantford.

Toronto:
PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., KING STREET WEST.
1874.

ADDRESS ON PROHIBITION.

MR. SPEAKER,

In rising to move the adoption of the Second Report of the Select Committee on Petitions presented for a Prohibitory Liquor Law, I cannot but express my regret, that my esteemed friend Mr. Bodwell, late member for South Oxford, who so ably and disinterestedly discussed matters connected with the temperance movement, has resigned his seat in the House. Both this House and the country are indebted to my honourable friend for inviting attention to a question which must, at no distant day, whether we will or not, command our most careful consideration.

In the first clause of the Report which I have the honour of presenting, your attention is called to the extent of the Prohibitory movement as indicated by the number of petitions presented. Last Session, these petitions were signed by thirty-six thousand one hundred and thirty-two individuals, principally from Ontario and Quebec. This Session, however, there are indications of a much more extended movement. Not only have Ontario and Quebec spoken out again, and much more decidedly too than before, but all the other Provinces of this fair Dominion as well. From the far west, British Columbia has sent us a request to stop the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Manitoba has made a similar request. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the last of the fair sisterhood of Provinces, that guards the eastern portal of the Dominion, has laid her request humbly at the foot of the throne, that this traffic, so long a reproach to our civilization and Christianity, should be at once and for ever blotted out of existence. These petitions still keep coming in, and already show an aggregate of one hundred thousand six hundred and eighty-seven signatures. Besides the petitions signed by individuals of all ranks and classes, we have petitions from various municipal and corporate bodies. Last Session, these petitions represented a population of one hundred and sixty thousand; this Session, they represent a population of three hundred and sixty-three thousand one hundred and thirty-five. This, sir, is not without its significance. When we see municipal officers in their official capacity—men chosen by their fellows to represent their interests—under the pressure of public opinion petitioning this House for a privilege which, without its sanction, they cannot obtain, it must be supposed that the popular desire is not only deep-seated, but active and energetic as well. And when to this we add, that a majority of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick over their own signatures, and the Legislative Assembly itself unanimously, over the signature of its official head, the Speaker, and the Local Legislature of Ontario, representing one million six hundred thousand souls, pray for such legislation as will prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, it cannot be said but the public opinion outside this House is what your committee reports it to be, "such as demands your serious attention."

It might be objected, sir, that these petitions are, in many cases,

signed by women and children, and therefore their importance as an exponent of public opinion very materially diminished. Well, suppose it so. Suppose that many women and children, whom of all others, we believe to suffer most from the evils complained of, humbly petition this House for a redress of the grievances under which they suffer, are we to say, or, is this House to lay down the horrible doctrine that because they *are women and children* their complaint is not to be heard? Not hear their complaint? Not listen to the prayer of their petition? Why? Are they not subjects of Her Majesty as surely as we are? Have they not only inherent rights as citizens, but constitutional rights as members of the body politic? And is this House to promulgate the unchristian, un-British doctrine, that while a House of Commons *may* listen to the petition of adults and electors, and redress their grievances *it must* close its ear to the petition of suffering women and children? Surely not. I mistake very much the temper of this House, if the simple fact of many of the class named having petitioned for a prohibition of the liquor traffic, does not give additional force to the petition—their very helplessness in distress, deepening the anxiety which will be evinced in protecting them, where they are unable to protect themselves.

It is also objected that, inasmuch as these petitions represent but a small percentage of the people of the country, they are not worthy of being entertained by this House, and that any legislation based upon their prayer would be uncalled for. It is true, sir, that the petitions signed by individuals represent a small percentage of our population, But how is it with those signed by corporations? How is it with the petition of the New Brunswick Legislature and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario? Why, sir, these unitedly represent a majority of the people of this Dominion, and surely the petition of a *majority* must command the attention of this House. Besides this House has not always waited to be petitioned by a majority of the people before taking action. How often have we seen some of the most important laws enacted, not only *without* the petition of a majority but without any petition *at all*. Last Session we adopted the Ballot and where were the petitions in its favour? This Session the Honourable Minister of Justice is giving us simultaneous polling, abolishing nomination day and the property qualification of members, and yet there were no petitions presented in favour of either of these changes. A few years ago, too, the whole constitutional fabric of the country was remodelled, old political landmarks removed and new political relations entered upon, and yet not one single petition presented in favour of this change from one end of the Dominion to the other. Surely this House is not to lay down rules with regard to this movement, that have never governed its actions in many other movements equally sweeping in their changes, and equally subversive of existing institutions.

Having now called the attention of the House to the extent of the demand for a Prohibitory Liquor Law, we will next consider the second clause of the Report which alleges the close connection between intemperance and crime of all kinds. Now, sir, it is very much to be deplored that in this Dominion, with all its legislative machinery, with its unsurpassed educational facilities, and the untiring efforts of both Press and Pulpit, that crime is on the increase, and that the ratio of increase is

much greater than the increase of population. According to the last census the ratio of increase in Ontario was 16.1 per cent. ; in Quebec it was 7.2 per cent., and for the four Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick it was 12.8 per cent. Now what do the statistics of crime for these Provinces, as contained in the Reports of the Inspectors of Prisons, show ? Just this, that while in Ontario the increase of population was only 12.1 per cent. in 10 years, or 1.21 per cent. per annum, the increase of commitments to the gaols was 20½ per cent. in 4 years or an increase of 5 per cent. per annum, an increase four times greater than the increase of population. Taking Ontario and Quebec together which gives an average increase in population of 1 per cent. per annum, the increase of commitments to the gaols was 35 per cent. in four years or an increase of 8¾ per cent. per annum ; and as a singular coincidence it may be stated that the increase of intoxicating liquors consumed by the people during the same time was 34 per cent., or one per cent. less than the increase of crime. It is also important to notice the classes that furnish this enormous increase. In the reports of the Prison Inspectors, all persons committed to gaol are classified either as "Temperate," or "Intemperate." This information being received from the prisoners themselves cannot in all cases be perfectly relied upon, but for purposes of comparison it might safely be accepted. These statistics show that, while there was only an increase of 7 per cent. among those calling themselves "temperate," there was an increase of 33½ per cent. among those calling themselves "intemperate," and an increase of 41½ per cent. in the arrests for "drunk and disorderly." Any honourable member who doubts the accuracy of these most humiliating figures can verify them by reference to the Reports of the Inspectors of Prisons for the years 1870 to 1873, inclusive. Further to corroborate the statements contained in the second clause of this report, let me read from a few of many answers to the query sent by the Committee to Police Magistrates and others whose official position brought them into contact with crime of every kind. And first let me begin with this city, the Capital of our Dominion. Mr Thomas Langrell, Chief of the Police, sent the Committee on Monday last, the following statement :—

Total No. of arrests in 1871-2-3	2,282
Intemperate	1,843
Temperate	439

This shews that only one-fifth of the whole number of arrests made belonged to the *temperate* classes.

Let us next take Montreal, the largest city in the neighbouring Province, as well as the largest city of the Dominion. From a statement kindly furnished the Committee by Mr. J. T. Sexton, Recorder of the city, we make the following extract :—

"There are besides myself three other gentlemen attached to the Court in which I preside, the Clerk of the Court, and two Assistants. All three are Barristers and gentlemen of mature age, perfectly competent to offer opinions on the subject of this question. With a view to obtain the best possible information in the matter, I propounded the question to each of them separately. All are of opinion with myself that, apart from the violations of statutory law, and the by-laws of the city, every case tried before the Court, with but very few, if indeed any exceptions, arises out of intemperance. The Clerk of the Court is of

the opinion that the proportion of the cases, which directly and manifestly owe their origin to intemperance is at least three-fourths ($\frac{3}{4}$); his first Assistant sets the same proportion down at seven-eighths ($\frac{7}{8}$); and the second Assistant at nine-tenths ($\frac{9}{10}$). My own opinion corresponds with the last estimate.

"The records of the Criminal Courts in all countries, and the dying declarations of the great majority of criminals who have suffered the extreme penalty of the law, all clearly establish that nearly all the crimes committed, especially all those of greater magnitude, would never have been conceived in the first place, or afterwards have been carried out to perpetration by the offenders, but for the baneful effects of intoxicating drink. Licensing the sale of intoxicating drink as a beverage cannot, therefore, be regarded otherwise than as productive of crime."

In a schedule attached to his report he gives the following figures as being the arrests made by the police in 1871–2–3 :—

1871.

Total no. of arrests of all kinds	10,584
Drunkenness	4,983
Offences arising out of the same, about	1,306
Total	6,289

1872.

Total arrests of all kinds	10,942
Drunkenness	5,651
Offences arising out of the same, about	1,350
Total	7,001

1873.

Total arrests of all kinds	12,085
Drunkenness	6,145
Offences arising out of the same	1,608
Total	7,753

Another fact brought out by this report is that in the last year the total number of arrests for drunkenness, included 1,017 females, and an analysis of the report brings out the other fact that, while the increase of crime of all kinds was 15 per cent., the increase of arrests for drunkenness and crimes arising therefrom, was 23½ per cent.

As a further confirmation of what the figures already quoted prove, permit me to read an extract from the very excellent report of Mr. F. W. L. Penton, Chief of Police :—

"And now a word about taverns. Alas! notwithstanding all the united efforts of clergymen of all denominations, and the good example set up by men of mark and position, by our legislators, and the executive officers of the law, drinking yet reigns supreme, and seems to enlarge the powers of doing evil; it is therefore with deep regret that I state that there were five hundred more individuals arrested for drunkenness in 1873 than in 1872. And no wonder, for instead of seeing the number of licenses curtailed, THIRTY-SEVEN more have been added to the dread list.

"Mostly all offences are due either directly or indirectly to intemperance. What is the cause of almost all larcenies? Drink! Of assaults? Drink! Disorderly conduct? Drink! Fights, furious driving, interference with the police, foul language, blasphemies? Drink, drink, drink! Of cowardly wife-beating? Drink! In short, intemperance is to be found as the universal direct or indirect cause of all evils. From these numerous hot-beds of all that is vicious issue forth a host of rowdies and idle and disorderly individuals, always on the look-out for mischief, and whose chief and most relished pastime seems to consist in attacking the police, rescuing prisoners, and spreading terror in certain portions of the city."

Let us next turn to Toronto, the chief city and the Capital of Ontario. From a statement kindly furnished the Committee by Mr. W. S. Prince, Chief of Police for that city, we have the following as the results of the labours of the police in 1871-2-3 :—

1871.

Total number of arrests of all kinds		4,737
Drunk and disorderly (males)	1,742	
Do. do. (females)	579	
Total	2,321	

1872.

Total number of arrests of all kinds		4,735
Drunk and disorderly (males)	2,036	
Do. do. (females)	599	
Total	2,635	

1873.

Total number of arrests of all kinds		5,654
Drunk and disorderly (males)	2,328	
Do. do. (females)	624	
Total	2,952	

This shows an increase in the total number of arrests of 19 per cent., and in the arrests for "drunk and disorderly" conduct of 27½ per cent.

It would weary the House were I to give you all the evidence collected by the Committee on this point. I will content myself with a few quotations from the evidence as regards other Provinces, and refer you to the digest contained in our report, which we hope to have the honour of submitting before the close of the Session. Well, then, as to the other Provinces: John R. Marshall, Chief of the Police force of St. John City, New Brunswick, says :—"Nearly all the crimes brought under my notice officially are attributable either directly or indirectly to the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage." He adds: "From the experience of a life time, of which eleven years I have been Chief of the Police of this city, I am satisfied that nothing short of a prohibitory liquor law will check this monstrous evil with which we are surrounded."

Mr. Blair, Police Magistrate of Chatham, says: That "75 per cent. of the crimes tried under my jurisdiction can be traced to intemperance."

Mr. J. A. Hardin, Sheriff, County of St. John, states: That "of the 1,500 persons committed to the gaol of the County of St. John the past year, 9-10ths were consequent upon intemperance, and in like rates for years past."

David Topley, Police Magistrate, Portland, St. John, N.B., says: That "one-third of the crimes appear, by the books in his office, traceable to intemperance."

Bartholomew Stapledon, Captain of Police, Chatham, N.B., says: "After 12 years' experience in the position I now hold, I should say ninety per cent. of the crimes tried under my jurisdiction can be traced to intemperance."

H. Q. Gilbert, Police Magistrate, St. John, N.B., says: "From an experience of 15 years I am fully satisfied that nine-tenths of the cases brought under my jurisdiction are chargeable to rum, and that pretty much all the evils of life are attributable, directly or indirectly, to the use of strong drink."

J. S. Ingrahan, Sheriff, Victor County (South), says: "Three-fourths of those brought under my official notice for the past three years, were victims of intemperance."

J. H. Caulback, Sheriff, County Lunenburg, N.S., says: "I would say about twenty per cent. of those brought under my official notice for the past three years were the victims of intemperance."

A. Sharp, Superintendent Lunatic Asylum, Victoria, B.C., says: "About seventy-five per cent., or seventeen out of twenty-three (23 being the whole number under treatment since the Asylum was instituted last October) of those who have come under my charge are the victims of intemperance."

J. Hamilton Gray, Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, says: That "three out of five cases tried under my jurisdiction can be traced to intemperance; but I have not been yet a year in office."

J. H. Sullivan, Superintendent Provincial Police, &c., Victoria, B.C., says: "About two-thirds of those brought under my official notice for the past three years were victims of intemperance. This proportion may seem high, but it is accounted for by the comparative absence of general crime."

Now, sir, to my mind this evidence is overwhelming. Let me just refer to evidence of another kind. In the presentment of the Grand Jury at the Assizes held in Toronto, in November, 1873, I find the following: "In considering the cause of crime, they (the Grand Jury) had no difficulty in tracing it to the use of intoxicating liquors, the facilities for obtaining which were without limit, owing to the very large number of taverns, saloons, and groceries, at which it can be obtained." And further on they say, "The Grand Jury have dwelt at length upon the subject, as they feel that a large portion of the crimes they had to consider arose from drunkenness."

In response to this presentment the Judge replied "that he admitted the correctness of their observation that most of the crime was caused through drunkenness."

The Goderich Grand Jury recently said: "We would give it as our opinion that the most of the evils and crimes amongst us *arise* from the drinking usages."

A Grand Jury in London said: "Nearly all the prisoners in the male wards acknowledge that they had committed the crimes for which they were confined while under the influence of drink."

Let it not be forgotten that this is the testimony of men, sworn to speak from a full knowledge of what they affirm, and not the testimony of men, who collect evidence for the simple purpose of establishing a case.

Further to sustain the allegation of the committee, let me briefly refer to other countries. In Maine, I find, where a Prohibitory Liquor Law is in force, that the number of convictions for crime in 1870, amounted to 431, or one for every 1689 souls; in New York, exclusive of the city, the number of convictions was 5,473, or one in 620 souls. Mr. Sidney Perham, Governor of the State of Maine, in his Annual Message to the State Legislature in 1872, says:—

"The time and money expended, the intellectual and physical powers destroyed, the hopes blasted, the homes desolated, the poverty and crime occasioned, and the lives sacrificed through the drinking habits of our people, would make an appalling chapter in our history.

"If we enquire at our State Prison we shall find that, prior to their conviction, eight per cent. of the convicts were not in the habit of using intoxicating drinks, twelve per cent. drank moderately, while eighty per cent. drank to excess, and their crimes were the direct result of this practice. A visit to our country jails would reveal similar facts. This shows that four-fifths of the crime, and consequently that proportion of all the expenses, as well as all the public and private evils resulting from the commission of crime, are the legitimate results of intemperance. Common observation furnishes convincing evidence that a large portion of the pauperism of the State is directly or indirectly attributable to the same cause."

Massachusetts furnishes similar testimony. Let me just make one reference. The report of the Chief of Police for the last quarter of 1867, when the State was under a Prohibitory Liquor Law, was as follows:—

No. of arrests	1,530
No. of lodgers	2,617
Total	4,147

For the corresponding quarter of 1868, under the license system, the record stood:—

No. of arrests	5,596
No. of lodgers	7,617
	13,213

Or 9,066 more taken in charge by the police in one quarter under the license system with free whisky, than under a Prohibitory Liquor Law, said by the opponents of the movement to be a failure.

Similar testimony comes from England. In 1868 the total number of apprehensions for drunkenness was 111,465; in 1871, 142,343, being an increase of 27½ per cent., the increase in the quantity of liquors used in the same period being 27½ per cent.

Lord Morpeth, when Secretary for Ireland, gave the following statistics in a speech on the condition of Ireland, delivered after a public

dinner in Dublin. "Of cases of murder, assault with attempt to murder, outrageous offence against the person, aggravated assault, cutting and maiming, there were in

1837..	12,096	1839	1,097
1838.....	11,058	1840	173

"It further appears that the number of persons charged with murder, within the police boundaries of Dublin was, in—

1838.....	14	1840...	2
1839	4	1841.....	1

"The consumption of spirits for the year 1840 (ending 5th January, 1841), had fallen, in round numbers to 7,000,000 gallons ; whereas in 1838 it was 12,000,000 gallons. Hence the falling off in the calendar."

Having now dwelt so long upon the grounds taken by your Committee in their report with regard to the connection between crime and intemperance, let me briefly refer to one objection—and I will endeavour to confine myself to one urged against the request contained in the petitions already referred to—that is, that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is "contrary to public policy as being an interference with trade." Sir, I ask is the Liquor Traffic really a trade as we commonly understand that word? Is it so regarded, judging by the many laws already enacted affecting its regulation and restriction? In regard to all other trades what do we find?—we find that the customs and tariff regulations of the country, so far as possible, are designed to foster and encourage their development. But with regard to the Liquor Traffic, the very opposite is the course adopted—thus establishing, and that by the authority of law, what the opponents of the traffic have long since said, that it is not a *trade* in the ordinary acceptance of the term. Again, we find that with regard to other trades and occupations the cry of the present day is "protection." The Honourable Member for Centre Wellington (Dr. Orton) has moved for a Select Committee to consider the interests of the agricultural classes. The Honourable Member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) has moved for a Committee to look after the interests of manufactures. Deputation after deputation of all classes, from India rubber makers to engine builders, have waited on the Honourable Minister of Finance to get some alteration in the tariff with a view to protect their own particular interests. And on what grounds do they claim this "protection?" Simply that their respective trades might be developed and that the raw material—the produce of the soil—might be utilized to the exclusion of the foreign manufactured article—thus, as they allege developing the native resources of the country. But where are the Petitions from liquor dealers asking for protection to their trade on the grounds that its expansion would develop the native resources of the country? On the contrary they admit the connection between *intemperance* (the *fruit* of the traffic) and crime, but on grounds of public policy, they say "don't prohibit the traffic. It would not be *public policy* to interfere with the trade—a trade which on their own admission produces intemperance and crime. Therefore it would not be public policy to interfere with crime. Surely this is the *reductio ad absurdum* argument with a vengeance.

Let me give another proof that, in the eye of the law, the Liquor Traffic is not regarded as a *trade*, but an *evil* against which, "on grounds

of public policy," the people should be protected. Overlooking the many checks and safeguards placed around the issuing of licenses, let me take the law referring to the closing of taverns between 7 o'clock on Saturday night and 6 o'clock on Monday morning. In this law the principle is " protection to the public "—a policy which you will admit, sir, to be perfectly sound and just. When this restrictive measure was discussed in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, its propriety was very much questioned, and a strong effort was made in certain quarters to prevent its becoming law. Let me read a few extracts from the speeches of members of that House to shew the grounds on which the restriction was defended :—

Mr. *Boyd* said that early closing had done no harm to the community ; and late closing would contribute towards a desecration of the Sabbath, and the spending of money which should go to the maintenance of the family.

Hon. Mr. *McMurrich* did not attach much importance to the hour for opening on Monday morning, but did attach the utmost importance to the hour for closing on Saturday evening. He urged strongly that 7 o'clock should be maintained.

Mr. *Pardee* said the country was very sensitive on this subject. As soon as it was observed that the Saturday evening law was going to be relaxed, petitions with thousands of names, poured in upon the House at once against the proposal.

Mr. *Cumberland*.—If taverns and saloons were kept open after seven and as late as nine, it would be disastrous to the working classes by increasing the temptation and the opportunity.

Mr. *Calvin* said he did mostly decidedly object to closing later than 7 on Saturday evening.

Dr. *Baxter* wished the 7 o'clock limit maintained.

Mr. *Lauder* said Saturday evening was the time of all others when artisans threw off all restraint, and he was therefore in favour of retaining the 7 o'clock limit as that would lessen the facilities for indulging.

Mr. *Blake* said in his judgment the drinking from seven to nine did all the harm. It led to subsequent drinking in many cases. He would say that if after full experience and a fair trial the law were found to be a dead letter then he would go with the Treasurer for its repeal, on the principle stated, that such a law ought not to be maintained on the Statute Book—(hear, hear). But it had not been shown to be a dead letter ; and as long as they could make it a living letter it ought to be written in gold, and never erased from the Statute Book.

Mr. *Fraser* said that in the interests of the working classes it was all-important to close the taverns at 7 o'clock. Who were asking for this proposed alteration ? Was it the public ? or even the artisans ? No ; it was the tavern-keepers, and we should not, at their bidding alter a good law.

Mr. *Gow* said this was essentially a case of the people *vs.* the tavern-keepers, and he hoped the House would stand by the people.

Mr. *Sinclair* said : He had been struck with the order and quiet which prevailed in Toronto on Saturday evenings, and he attributed it to the 7 o'clock law. It was to be considered, moreover, that if the taverns were allowed to remain open till nine, they could not close at that hour, with crowds of excited men in the premises.

Mr. *Trow* said, that whatever might be the case in the country, the 7 o'clock rule was good in the cities.

Now, the drift of all these remarks was, that the interest of the *public* were paramount to that of the *publican*, and that whether or not the restriction would be inconvenient, "on grounds of *public policy*," the restriction must be *made*, and as one distinguished member of that House, but yet more distinguished here, said, "it must be written in letters of gold and never blotted from out the Statute Book."

The same protective principle applies to the law preventing the sale of liquors to Indians. In any other case, I ask, is there any restriction upon what the Indian should buy? And why? Because no evil effect could possibly flow from his exchanging his means for either the produce of the farm or the factory; but in this case, there is a danger, and as that danger arise from the influences of a traffic which the law simply tolerates, in the interests of the public, the toleration is withdrawn and the evils dreaded removed, so far as lies within the power of law.

My next proposition is, that if the liquor traffic is a *trade*, (as its supporters say it is) then the rules applied to other trades must apply to its operations also. The first principle involved in any trade is, that by its natural and legitimate operations it becomes a wealth producer; that is, it takes the raw material, and by the changes peculiar to itself, makes it or manufactures it into something valuable. This is true of agriculture, manufactures, and all other trades and callings of a legitimate character. For instance, the farmer, out of the raw material, which in his case is uncultivated soil, manufactures or grows (with the blessing of Heaven) abundant harvests by which he provides food for the million. The manufacturer takes the raw material likewise, it may be the timber, or iron, or wool, &c., and by his industry and skill operates on these to make them valuable. Now, sir, if this liquor traffic is a trade, legitimate in its operations, it must accord with the rules which govern other trades. Does it do this? Do its operations increase the value of the raw material? So far as the manufacture of intoxicating liquors from grain, &c., is concerned, it might be said to increase their value, at least, as a marketable commodity. But in its operations as a commodity, does it go on increasing the value of the raw material? Look at the victims of intemperance; the natural and legitimate fruit of the traffic, and then answer the question. My Hon. friend from Quebec Centre, (Mr. Cauchon,) corrects me, and says: "*illegitimate* fruit." I say no, but the *legitimate* and invariable fruit of the traffic, for they are one and inseparable. Look on those young men who are addicted to drink; those men who are the raw material upon which the traffic operates, and then tell me if they are manufactured into that which is more valuable and more useful to society? Are they better citizens, better mechanics, or better farmers, because the traffic has to a certain extent, sapped their health and ruined their prospects? We have heard a good deal this Session about the sources of Canadian wealth, and from the anxiety evinced by the champions of every special branch of industry one would think that the prosperity of any one of them would confer inestimable benefits upon the country. But sir, let me say, our wealth does not consist in its agricultural, manufacturing or mining interests, either singly or combined. The real source of Canadian wealth is the *brain* and *muscle* of the people of this country, and any traffic that destroys the

brain, or depreciates the muscle, strikes at the foundation of all national power, and involves a loss far greater than the mere decline of any branch of industry, no matter how great its advantages may be lauded by its advocates. To waste such raw material would be ultimately to dry the very fountains of national power, and to write ruin, desolation, and death upon all our national industries.

But this loss to the natural industries of the country may be further seen, by considering how intemperance reduces the industrial productiveness of the people. It is no new proposition to advance that pauperism as well as crime is the legitimate fruit of intemperance. Hear what Mr. Wm. Hoyle, an eminent English statistician, says on this point: "With a population of 23,000,000, England and Wales spent in five years, ending 1870, on an average, £4. 5s. 11½d. (or about $21) on intoxicating drinks, and had a death rate of 22.2 per 1000, and 46.35 paupers for the same number. Ireland with five and a half millions spent, during the same time, only £2. 1s. 1d. (or about $10) per head, and had a mortality of 16.7 per 1000, and instead of 46.35 paupers per 1000, had only 13.3."

Now sir, it must be evident, that a traffic which tends to produce pauperism must operate injuriously on the industrial prosperity of the country. But let me give further testimony on this point. The Canterbury Convocation of England, in an elaborate report upon the prevalence of intemperance, after referring to the expense of maintaining a pauper population of about one and a half millions, says: "When we add to this drain on the national resources the loss of at least *one day in six* of productive labour in almost every department of trade throughout the kingdom, the derangement of many of our industrial operations, and the imperfection of the work produced in consequence of the intemperate habits of our people, the loss to the nation in strength and skill is calculated on competent evidence, to amount to one-sixth of the aggregate of our productive resources." This statement is further corroborated by the report made by a Select Committee of the British House of Commons so far back as 1834. This committee, of which Lord Althorpe, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. J. S. Buckingham, Mr. Hawes, and other distinguished men were members, estimated that one million out of every six of the whole manufactured, mineral and agricultural productions of the country was the loss sustained by the commerce of the country from intemperance. Now, sir, supposing that in Canada the ravages of intemperance are not so great; supposing that the loss to the industry of the country is one-tenth, instead of one-sixth; let us calculate what that loss really is. By the census of 1871, we find that the various industries of this country are carried on by 1,009,848 persons. This includes every person who reported himself as being engaged in any occupation whatever. Well then, if one-tenth of the industrial energy of the people is lost through intemperance, it follows that one-tenth of our working population, or 100,000 persons, are non-producers, that is, they add nothing to the productive wealth of the country. Sir, I ask the particular attention of the House to this startling fact. Our opponents tell us that the prohibition of this traffic would be "an interference with trade." Why sir, it is the existence of the traffic that interferes with trade, and could the traffic be stopped effectually, it would add to the industrial wealth of this country—the pro-

duce of 100,000 persons. Let me ask my Hon. friend the Minister of Immigration, what he would give if he could add at this present moment 100,000 labourers to the population of this country, representing as it would an aggregate population of 400,000 persons. Such an addition to the labour capacity of our country would give a stimulus to trade that would be felt in every branch of industry, and I very much doubt if there would be any more clamouring for protection either to manufacturers or agriculture.

But, sir, this is not the only loss to the industry of the country. Another great loss is this—that the liquor traffic absorbs a larger proportion of the wealth of the country than it gives *labour-value* for. The value of any industry to a country consists in three things—the latent resources which it may develop, the value which it gives to the raw material, and the amount of labour which it represents. Now, sir, the liquor traffic develops no latent resources, but the latent resources of evil. I have shown in its ultimate results that it destroys the raw material, and I will now show the manner in which it absorbs the national wealth without absorbing a corresponding amount of labour. From the report of Commissioner Wells, of the U.S. Inland Revenue Department, for 1868, we find the number of distilleries to be 1,193, employing 5,416 hands, or nearly an average of 5 hands to each distillery. In Canada we have 18 distilleries and 151 breweries, being a total of 169. Supposing these employed an average of 12 hands each, this would give about 2,000 hands for the production of the liquor made or consumed in Canada. Now, sir, the amount of money paid by the consumer for intoxicating drinks will represent the capital actually absorbed by the traffic. To ascertain that amount with accuracy is somewhat difficult, but a fair approximation at least may be made. For instance, the consumption of intoxicating liquors in England, according to Mr. Hoyle, the author previously quoted, and Leone Levi, another eminent statistician, amounted, in 1872, to £130,000,000, or nearly $20 per head. In the United States, according to Commissioner Wells, than whom there can be no better authority, in 1870, it amounted to $1,463,000,000, or nearly $40 per head. It is also generally held that the consumer, taking the dilution of the liquors into consideration, and the large profits made by the retail dealer, pays for his drink five times the amount of the duty. This estimation—and I am sure you will consider it a very reasonable one—would give the sum of $25,000,000 as the capital absorbed in Canada by the liquor traffic, or about an average of $6 per head. Now, sir, the argument is this—that this capital absorbs only the labour of 2,000 persons as manufacturers, or, if you choose, you may add the retailers as well, which would make 14,000 in all, whereas the same capital expended in any other way would absorb the labour of over 50,000 persons, at the wages of $10 per week. Did the workingmen of this country but realize what an enormous advantage would accrue to their interests by the diversion of this large amount of capital to other industries, they would certainly sustain and encourage any movement for the overthrow of this enemy of national industry.

From what has been now said in regard to the destructive character of the liquor traffic it must be evident to the House that it is a very doubtful source of revenue to the country. It is known to every reader of political economy that revenue is but a tax on the surplus wealth of the

people. Then, if any trade has a tendency to diminish this wealth it destroys that from which alone revenue can be derived, and by destroying the tree destroys the fruit. But even if the traffic were productive of revenue, the cost of collection is so great that we should hesitate before we consented to accept it on such grounds. Let us see what that cost is. In the first place there is the cost to the Department, which might fairly be put at $100,000. Next, there is the sacrifice of one-tenth of the industrial energy of the country. What this amounts to may be fairly estimated on the following grounds. The industrial energy of a people is seen in the amount of the goods they produce over and above what they consume. This production is seen annually in the exports of the country. Last year the exports of Canada, that is the production of her one million labourers, amounted to $90,610,573, or an average surplus production of $90 to each labourer. Then the loss on 100,000 labourers would be $9,000,000. Then we have the annual sacrifice of at least 4,000 lives, or one-tenth of one per cent. In England the loss is put at 60,000 annually, or one out of every 650 inhabitants. Now these lives represent, according to the statement made in the House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), while speaking on another subject, a cash value to the country of $1,500 each, or an aggregate of $6,000,000. Then we have the amount spent on liquors already put at $25,000,000—this of course includes the cost of the material consumed in the manufacture of these liquors. Then we have the cost of the administration of justice; the maintenance of police force; the payment of police magistrates, jurors and other officials; the interest on the capital absorbed in prisons and penitentiaries, a certain portion of which is chargeable to the traffic, and which cannot be very easily reduced; and this we pay, all for the sake of the paltry revenue of $5,000,000.

Note.—A recapitulation of these items would be as follows:—

Loss of $\frac{1}{10}$ national industry	$9,000,000
Sacrifice of life	6,000,000
Money spent on drink	25,000,000
Other losses referred to, say	1,000,000
Total	$41,000,000
From which deduct revenue	5,000,000
Total loss	$36,000,000

Now, sir, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if these figures do not shew that, even should the revenue suffer a temporary derangement by the prohibition of the traffic, whether or not the country can afford to pay out $41,000,000 in order that he can avail himself of $5,000,000 to relieve the pressure upon the expenditure for public works and other necessary improvements? I said *temporary* derangement, and I believe it would only be temporary. I think the impetus that would be given to trade by the increased thrift and industry of the people would very soon counterbalance the loss. Indeed, sir, I doubt very much if the revenue would not almost immediately be compensated from other sources. The money formerly spent on liquors would still be in the country. It would not be buried in the ground or wrapped

up in a napkin. It would doubtless find its way through many channels into the public exchequer, without inflicting upon society any of those evils incident to the liquor traffic. Dutiable goods of other kinds would be more largely consumed, and what now is expended to gratify the base passions would doubtless contribute to the happiness and comfort of many of the suffering and the destitute. This was the case with Ireland some years ago. In the years 1809–10 and 1813–14 there was great scarcity in Ireland, and the distilleries were closed by order of the Government. Yet it was found that in these four years in which the consumption of liquors fell from 7½ million gallons to 4¼ million, that the receipts from dutiable goods of other kinds was considerably greater than during the years 1811–12 and 1815–16, in which there was no scarcity of food but a great abundance of drink through the distilleries being opened. The following figures are from the Tables of Trade and Navigation: In the importation of

Haberdashery, there was an increase of.....	£ 30,000
Drapery.....	1,356,170 yds.
Iron and Hardware.....	£129,650
Cotton Goods.....	£ 93,000
Blankets.....	33,401 num.
Black tea.....	341,511 lbs.
Sugar.....	4,324 cwt.

These results attained under the reduction of less than one half the ordinary expenditure of the people upon intoxicating liquors, give a tolerably good idea of what would be attained under a thorough system of prohibition.

But, even should the revenue suffer, what then? Should this House take no cognizance of these petitions, because the granting of their prayer would affect the revenue? Are we to say, no matter what the sacrifice of life may be, no matter what the misery and crime produced, no matter what the industrial loss, revenue we must have and will have? Surely *not*. For my own part I have decided my course. On a question like this when the choice is between the paltry revenue of a few millions—paltry, because life is invaluable as compared with money—and the sacrifice of many of the noblest and best of our young men, I decide in favour of humanity. I stand on the side of the young men. When the choice lies between national morality and happiness, and the Minister's financial balance sheet, I stand on the side of morality. When the choice is between the best interests of the many and the selfish interests of the few, I stand with the majority. And I do hope that the House animated by those considerations of patriotism which should always guide its deliberations, will rise to the realization of the full magnitude of this important question, and in its wisdom devise such legislation as will protect society from the destructive influences of intemperance. All we ask now is, that a commission should be appointed to make enquiry regarding the success of the means adopted by other countries for the removal of this evil. With this information in our possession, we will then be in a position to take further action. I now move the adoption of the second report of the Select Committee on Prohibition.

(The honourable gentleman on resuming his seat was greeted with applause from both sides of the House.)